arXiv:cond-mat/0604192v1 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci] 7 Apr 2006

Ab initio real-space Hartree-Fock and correlated approach to optical dielectric constants of crystalline insulators

Priya Sony and Alok Shukla
Physics Department, Indian Institute of Technology, Powai, Mumbai 400076, INDIA

In this paper we present an approach aimed at calculating the optical dielectric constant (ϵ_∞) of crystalline insulators both at the Hartree-Fock, and correlated levels. Our scheme employs a real-space methodology, employing Wannier functions as the basic building blocks. The scheme has been applied to compute ϵ_∞ for LiF, LiCl, MgO, and Li_2O. In all the cases, results of correlated calculations, based upon systematic many-body corrections beyond Hartree-Fock, exhibit excellent agreement with the experiments. To the best of our knowledge, the calculations presented here are the first of their kind for bulk solids.

PACS numbers: 77.22.-d, 71.10.-w, 71.15.-m

I. INTRODUCTION

It is of considerable interest to be able to compute various properties of solids using an *ab initio* methodology based upon their many-particle wave functions[1]. Such an approach allows one to initiate the calculations at the Hartree-Fock level, and then systematically improve them by including the electron-correlation effects to the desired level of sophistication[1]. In our recent work, we have developed such a methodology for performing electronic structure calculations on crystalline insulators[2,3,4,5,6]. The approach employs a real-space philosophy with Wannier functions (WFs) used as the single-particle basis[2,3,4]. Electron-correlation effects are subsequently included by employing the "incremental scheme" which is nothing but a Bethe-Goldstone-like many-body hierarchy, consisting of virtual excitations into localized unoccupied orbitals[7]. Early applications of this approach consisted of calculations of ground state geometries, cohesive energies, and elastic properties of crystalline insulators at the Hartree-Fock level[2,3,4], as well as at the many-body level[5,6]. Recently, we extended the approach to perform both Hartree-Fock and many-body calculations of the Born effective charges of insulators using a finite-field approach[8]. In the present work we further extend our approach to compute a very important quantity associated with dielectrics, namely the optical dielectric constant ϵ_∞. Optical dielectric constant is a quantity to which electron correlation effects can make significant contributions. The fact that it is difficult to compute this quantity accurately is obvious because it is only in the second-order perturbation expansion of the total energy that the corrections due to the polarizability of the system make their first appearance. In this paper we demonstrate that our *ab initio* Wannier-function-based methodology can also be used to perform accurate calculations of ϵ_∞, by reporting results on bulk LiF, LiCl, MgO, and Li_2O. The theoretical results in all the cases are in very good agreement with the experiments. Besides exploring the influence of electron-correlation effects on ϵ_∞, we also examine the influence of the choice of basis functions on this quantity. We conclude that the best computation of electron-correlation effects is achieved only if the basis set is of good quality. Additionally, wherever possible, we also compare our results on ϵ_∞ to those obtained using the density-functional theory (DFT) based approaches.

Remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In section II we briefly discuss the theoretical aspects of our approach. Next, in section III we present and discuss the results of our *ab initio* calculations performed on various systems. Finally, in section IV we present our conclusions.

II. THEORY

Starting point of our approach is the expression of the electronic contribution to the polarization per unit cell (dipole moment per unit volume, $\mathbf{P}^{(e)}$) defined as the expectation value[10]

$$\mathbf{P}^{(e)} = \frac{q_e}{N\Omega}\langle\Psi_0|\mathbf{R}_e|\Psi_0\rangle, \tag{1}$$

where Ω is the volume of the unit cell, q_e is the electronic charge, N ($\rightarrow \infty$), represents the total number of unit cells in the crystal, $\mathbf{R}_e = \sum_{k=1}^{N_e} \mathbf{r_k}$ is the many-particle position operator for the N_e electrons of the crystal, and $|\Psi_0\rangle$ represents the correlated ground-state wave-function of the infinite solid. From the polarization, the dielectric susceptibility tensor (per unit cell) of the solid (χ_{ij}) can be computed as

$$\chi_{ij} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{P}_i^{(e)}}{\partial \mathbf{E}_j} \tag{2}$$

where, $\mathbf{E}$ is the external electric field, and i and j refer to the Cartesian components of the vector quantities involved. For the cubic crystals considered here, only the diagonal components of χ_{ij} are nonzero, which we denote as χ, henceforth. Finally, the dielectric constant of the crystal can be computed from the well know expression $\epsilon = 1 + 4\pi\chi$. By computing the polarization of the crystal for atomic positions corresponding to its ground state (i.e. no relaxation in the presence of applied electric field), the dielectric constant obtained will be the optical dielectric constant ϵ_∞ of the crystal. In the present work, we avoid the tedious route of calculating first the correlated many-particle wave function of the system ($|\Psi_0\rangle$), followed by the expectation value of the dipole operator (cf. Eq. (1)) and its subsequent derivative. Instead, we use the generalized Hellman-Feynman theorem, and the finite-field approach of computing dipole expectation values[11]. Accordingly, we employ the modified Hamiltonian

$$H'(\mathbf{E}) \; = \; H_0 - q_e \mathbf{E} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{N_e} \mathbf{r}_k, \tag{3}$$

where H_0 is the usual Born-Oppenheimer Hamiltonian for the solid, and $\mathbf{E}$ is a user specified external electric field[12]. This leads to the modified Hartree-Fock equations in the Wannier representation

$$(T + U + 2J - K + \lambda P_{\mathcal{E}} - q_e \mathbf{E}{\cdot}\mathbf{r})|\alpha\rangle = \epsilon_\alpha |\alpha\rangle, \tag{4}$$

where T represents the kinetic-energy operator, U is the electron-nucleus potential energy, J is the Coulomb term (or the direct term) of the electron-electron repulsion, K is the corresponding exchange term, $P_{\mathcal{E}}$ is the projection operator constructed from the WFs in the short-range environment $\mathcal{E}$ of the reference unit cell, λ is a large shift parameter, $|\alpha\rangle$ is one of the WFs in the reference unit cell, and ϵ_α is the corresponding eigenvalue. The projection operator $P_{\mathcal{E}}$, coupled with λ, plays the role of the localizing potential, leading to self-consistent calculation of WFs localized in the reference unit cell.[2,3] The notations used here are consistent with those in our original work aimed at direct determination of WFs of crystalline insulators[2,3], and are explained there in detail. The novelty of Eq. (4), as compared to the original Hartree-Fock equations[2,3], is the presence of the term corresponding to the electric field. Thus the WFs $|\alpha\rangle$ above, are obtained in the presence of an external electric field, and therefore include the effects of dielectric polarization as also enunciated by Nunes and Vanderbilt for tight-binding Hamiltonian[12]. One has to be careful in choosing the values of the electric field $\mathbf{E}$, because very large values can destroy the lower-bounds of the spectrum leading to catastrophic results[12]. In the present work the maximum magnitude $|\mathbf{E}| = 0.01$ a.u. was used, and it did not cause any numerical problems.

Once the Hartree-Fock equations for the system—with and without the external electric field $\mathbf{E}$—have been solved, the correlation effects are included by adopting the approach described in our earlier papers.[5,6,8] For both types of many-body calculations (i.e. with and without the electric field), the correlation energy per unit cell is computed as per "incremental expansion"[7],

$$E_{corr} \; = \; \sum_i \epsilon_i + \frac{1}{2!}\sum_{i \neq j} \Delta\epsilon_{ij} + \frac{1}{3!}\sum_{i \neq j \neq k} \Delta\epsilon_{ijk} + \cdots \tag{5}$$

where ϵ_i, $\Delta\epsilon_{ij}$, $\Delta\epsilon_{ijk}, \ldots$ etc. are respectively the one-, two- and three-body,... correlation increments obtained by considering simultaneous virtual excitations from one, two, or three occupied WFs, and i, j, $k, \ldots$ label the WFs involved[5]. The total correlated energy/cell E_{cell} can be simply obtained by adding E_{corr} to the Hartree-Fock energy E_{HF} of the system, *i.e.*, $E_{cell}(\mathbf{E}) = E_{HF}(\mathbf{E}) + E_{corr}(\mathbf{E})$. In the previous equation we have included the external electric field $\mathbf{E}$ explicitly in the parentheses to highlight the fact that all the energies involved in the expression depend upon it. As in our earlier works, the correlation approach used for computing various increments was the full configuration-interaction (FCI) method, and the incremental expansion was restricted to the two-body terms[5,6,8]. For all the materials investigated, there are four valence WFs (ns and three np functions, n being the principal quantum number of the valence band) per unit cell. Therefore, the number of one- and two-body increments for these materials is quite large. However, by using various point-group symmetries, we significantly reduced the total number of increments actually computed. Finally, the susceptibility/cell of the system concerned is obtained using the relation

$$\chi_{ij} = -\frac{\partial^2 E_{cell}}{\partial \mathbf{E}_i \partial \mathbf{E}_j}. \tag{6}$$

The second derivative of the total energy/cell, with respect to the external electric field needed in the equation above is computed numerically, using the well-known central-difference formula.

III. CALCULATIONS AND RESULTS

Present calculations were performed using lobe-type Gaussian basis functions employed in our earlier works as well[2,3,4,5,6,8]. For MgO, we used the basis set used by McCarthy and Harrison[9]. For Li_2O, LiCl, and MgO we went beyond the sp-type basis sets, and augmented them with a single d-type function centered on the anion, with the exponents 0.8 for O in MgO, 0.65 for O in Li_2O, and 0.9 for Cl in LiCl. The short range environment region $\mathcal{E}$ (cf. Eq.(4)) was taken to include up to third-nearest neighbors of the reference unit cell. Therefore, the unit cell WFs for all the materials studied were described using basis functions centered in the cells as far as the third-nearest neighbors of the reference cell[2,3]. For all the compound we used the experimental values of the lattice constants which were of 4.19 Å for MgO, 4.573 Å for Li_2O, 3.99 Å for LiF, and 5.07 Å for LiCl. For all the systems, the fcc geometry was assumed. In MgO, LiF, and LiCl, the anion and the cation locations in the primitive cell were taken to be $(0,0,0)$ and $(a/2,0,0)$, respectively, while in Li_2O, the anion was located at $(0,0,0)$, and cations were located at positions

$(\pm a/4, \pm a/4, \pm a/4)$, where a is the lattice constant. During the correlated calculations, for LiF and Li_2O, the $1s$ WFs of both the cations and the anions were treated as frozen core. In MgO, $1s$ WFs of both the atoms, while $2s$, and $2p$ WFs located on the Mg were held frozen. In case of LiCl, $1s$ WF of Li, and $1s$, $2s$, and $2p$ WFs of Cl were held frozen, while $3s$, and $3p$ chlorine WFs were correlated. Thus, during the correlated calculations, the virtual excitations were considered only from the valence WFs of the respective compounds. For numerical calculations of the susceptibility (see Eq. (6)), we used the central difference formula for the second derivative, along with the values of the external electric field $\mathbf{E}$ ranging from ± 0.001 a.u. to ± 0.01, in the x direction.

Results of our calculations are presented in tables I and II. Finally, in table III, our best results are compared with the experimental values, and also with those of other authors. First, we examine Table I which presents the calculated values of ϵ_∞ for LiF, Li_2O, LiCl, and MgO obtained at the HF level, and at various levels of correlation treatment, employing different basis sets. As mentioned earlier, we have included correlation corrections using a real-space Wannier-function-based approach developed earlier by us[5,6,8]. In the present case, the included correlation contributions correspond to one- and two-body increments confined to the WFs in the reference cell. Thus two-body contributions corresponding to WFs in the nearest-neighboring cells (and beyond) have not been included. Elsewhere, we will report that the correlation contributions to ϵ_∞ arising from two-body increments decrease rapidly with the increasing distances between the WFs involved. Therefore, the inclusion of correlation increments reported here will suffice for most cases. When we compare the results of our best calculations to the experimental ones (cf. table III), we find that generally the agreement between the two is excellent. The maximum disagreement is for MgO, with a relative error of 6.8%. For other three compounds the relative error is well below 5%. Next we analyze the results of these materials one-by-one. Upon comparing the results of our Hartree-Fock values of ϵ_∞ for LiF with the experimental one, we obtain very good agreement between the two with the theoretical value being slightly smaller than the experimental one. Next, when we include the correlation effects, the theoretical value increases a bit, but still stays in a excellent agreement with the experimental value. For the case of MgO, we note that the results obtained with the sp basis set are in poor agreement with the experiments, the disagreement being $\approx$27%. Upon including the single d-type exponent, the improvement in the results begins at the HF level itself, with the correlation contributions eventually bringing the results in close agreement with the experiments. In table I, similar trends are seen for the remaining compounds Li_2O and LiCl in that the results are generally in poor agreement with the experiments if only the sp basis sets are used, however, inclusion of d exponent brings them in excellent agreement with the experiments. Noteworthy point is that it is only with the inclusion of d exponents that correlation contributions are significant, a point which is well-known in the quantum-chemistry community in the context of polarizability calculations[13]. Now the question arises as to why excellent results were obtained for LiF just with the sp basis set, while for MgO, Li_2O, and LiCl inclusion of the d exponents was essential. The fact that for LiF, excellent results are obtained even without the use of d-type functions, is a clear indication of the fact that in F^- ion valence electrons are extremely localized owing to the large electron affinity of fluorine, and, therefore, can be described well with an sp basis set. For Li_2O we attribute the large influence of d-type functions to the extremely diffuse nature of the valence electrons of O^{--} ion. As a matter of fact, O^{--} ion does not exist in free form, and is stabilized only because of the crystal field. Similarly, Cl^- ion is comparatively more diffuse as compared to the F^- ion, thereby requiring the use of the d-type functions. The other trend which is clearly visible from table I is that when the calculations are performed with a proper basis set, inclusion of the electron correlation effects brings the results in much closer agreement with the experimental values, as compared to the HF results.

Next in table II we examine the relative contributions different correlation increments to the value of ϵ_∞ of these materials. Inspection of the table reveals that some very clear trends are visible regarding various contributions. In all the cases it is seen that the inclusion of the one-body increments increases the value of the ϵ_∞ with respect to the HF value. As far as the contribution of the two-body increments is concerned, table II reveals that for all the materials except for LiF, this contribution is negative when the sp basis set is employed. This, in our opinion, is a consequence of an inadequate basis set. Once the spd basis sets are employed for these materials, the contribution of this increment becomes significantly larger in magnitude, and positive in sign, to bring the final values of ϵ_∞ in excellent agreement with the experiments.

Finally, in table III we compare the results of our calculations with those of other authors. As far as the DFT-based approaches are concerned, one very powerful approach aimed at computing ϵ_∞ is the density-functional perturbation theory (DFPT) method[14]. But, for the materials considered here, we were unable to locate any calculations of ϵ_∞ based upon DFPT. However, in the literature we found several results on ϵ_∞ based on other DFT-based approaches which we discuss next. Umari and Pasquarello[15] presented *ab initio* molecular dynamics based calculations of ϵ_∞ of MgO, performed in the presence of a finite electric field. Mei *et al.*[16] performed DFT-based calculations of ϵ_∞ of LiF and LiCl, using localized charge densities. For LiF and several other materials, Bernardini and Fiorentini[17] reported calculations of ϵ_∞ using a "polarization approach" in which they performed DFT-based calculations on slabs of the material to calculate macroscopic polarization. Then they obtained the values of ϵ_∞ by using a relation between the interface charge, polarization difference and ϵ_∞. To the best of our knowledge no prior calculations of ϵ_∞ of Li_2O exist. When we compare our results on MgO with those of Umari and Pasquarello[15], it is obvious that the two results are in excellent agreement with each other. For LiF, our results and those of Mei *et al.*[16] agree almost perfectly, while the ones of Bernardini and Fiorentini[17] overestimate the experimental value. For LiCl results of Mei *et al.* overestimate ϵ_∞ somewhat as compared to the experimental value, while our results are almost in perfect agreement with the experiments.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have presented an *ab initio* wave-function-based approach aimed at computing the optical dielectric constant of insulators both at the Hartree-Fock level, and the correlated level, employing a real-space Wannier-function-based formalism. The approach was applied to compute the ϵ_∞ of crystalline LiF, Li_2O, LiCl, and MgO, and very good agreement with the experimental results was obtained. The attractive aspect of the approach is that the correlation effects are organized as per a Bethe-Goldstone-like many-body hierarchy, which makes itself amenable to systematic expansion or truncation. The influences of various terms in this correlation hierarchy on the value of ϵ_∞ was examined for all the systems, which, in our opinion, leads to a deeper understanding of the many-body effects. Additionally, the influence of the choice of basis set on the computed values of ϵ_∞ was also explored. The results presented in this work suggest that this methodology holds promise, and its applications to more complex systems such as perovskites will be pursued in future.

Acknowledgments

We thank Department of Science and Technology (DST), Government of India, for providing financial support for this work under grant no. SP/S2/M-10/2000.

Table I: Calculated values of ϵ_∞ for MgO, LiF, Li_2O, and LiCl obtained at various levels of approximations and using different basis sets. Column with the heading HF refers to results obtained at the Hartree-Fock level. Headings "one-body/two-body" refer to results obtained after including the corrections due to "one-body/two-body" excitations from Wannier functions of the unit cell, to the HF value.

	ϵ_∞		
System	HF	one-Body	two-Body
LiF (sp basis set)	1.924	2.029	2.044
MgO (sp basis set)	2.11	2.15	2.14
MgO (spd basis set)	2.33	2.42	2.76
Li_2O(sp basis set)	1.839	1.873	1.857
Li_2O(spd basis set)	2.09	2.33	2.62
LiCl (sp basis set)	1.887	1.929	1.911
LiCl (spd basis set)	2.096	2.139	2.833

---

[1] For a review of wave-function-based methods see, P. Fulde, Adv. Phys. **51**, 909 (2002).

[2] A. Shukla, M. Dolg, H. Stoll, and P. Fulde, Chem. Phys. Lett. **262**, 213 (1996).

[3] A. Shukla, M. Dolg, P. Fulde, and H. Stoll, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 1471 (1998).

[4] A. Shukla, M. Dolg, P. Fulde and H. Stoll, J. Chem. Phys. 108, 8521 (1998).

[5] A. Shukla, M. Dolg, P. Fulde, and H. Stoll, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 5211 (1999).

[6] A. Abdurahman, A. Shukla, and M. Dolg, J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 4801 (2000).

[7] H. Stoll, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 6700 (1992); H. Stoll, Chem. Phys. Lett. **191**, 548 (1992).

[8] P. Sony and A. Shukla, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 241103(R) (2004).

[9] M.I. McCarthy and N.M. Harrison, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 8574 (1994).

[10] For conceptual issues associated with the polarization of solids and the expectation value of their position operator see: R.D. King-Smith and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B **47**, R1651 (1993); R. Resta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1800 (1998); G. Ortiz and R.M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 14202 (1994); I Souza, T. Wilkens, and R.M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 1666 (2000).

[11] See, *e.g.*, R. McWeeny, *Methods of Molecular Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd edition (Academic Press, London, 1989).

[12] See, *e.g.*, R.W. Nunes and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 712 (1994).

[13] See, *e.g.*, D. E. Woon and T. H. Dunning, Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **100**, 2975 (1994).

[14] S. Baroni, P. Giannozzi, and A. Testa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1861 (1987); X. Gonze, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 10337 (1997); X. Gonze and C. Lee, *ibid.* **55**, 10355 (1997), and references therein.

[15] P. Umari and A. Pasquarello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 157602 (2002).

[16] W. N. Mei, L. L. Boyer, M. J. Mehl, M. M. Ossowski, H. T. Stokes, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 11425 (2000).

[17] F. Bernardini and V. Fiorentini, Phys. Rev. B **58**, R15292 (1998).

[18] M. E. Lines, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 3372 (1990); *Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, edited by D. R. Lide (CRC Press, New York, 1998), pp. 12-52.

[19] T. Osaka and I. Shindo, Sol. St. Comm. **51**, 421 (1984).

[20] M.J.L. Sangster, U. Schröder, and R.M. Atwood, J. Phys. C. **11**, 1523 (1978).

Table II: Contribution of various types of electron-correlation effects to ϵ_∞. Both the one-body and the two-body contributions arise from virtual excitations from the WFs located within the reference cell. Heading two-body (O) implies the corrections due to simultaneous excitations from two distinct Wannier functions located on the anion in the reference unit cell.

	ϵ_∞	
System	one-body	two-Body(O)
LiF(sp basis set)	0.105	0.015
MgO (sp basis set)	0.039	-0.008
MgO (spd basis set)	0.087	0.338
Li_2O(sp basis set)	0.034	-0.016
Li_2O(spd basis set)	0.239	0.295
LiCl (sp basis set)	0.042	-0.018
LiCl (spd basis set)	0.043	0.694

Table III: Comparison of our best values of ϵ_∞ of various materials with those of other authors, and experiments.

System	This work	Other works	Experiment
MgO	2.76	2.78^a	2.96^d
Li_2O	2.62	—	2.68^e
LiF	2.04	2.03^b, 2.19^c	1.96^f
LiCl	2.83	2.95^b	2.79^f

[a] Reference[15]
[b] Reference[16]
[c] Reference[17]
[d] Reference[18]
[e] Reference[19]
[f] Reference[20]